

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 7, 2006. Claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 28 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 13 and 14 are still the only independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a newly-cited secondary reference to U.S. Patent 6,173,322 (Hu). Thus, independent Claim 1 was rejected over U.S. Patent 6,477,586 (Achenson, already of record) in view of Hu; independent Claim 13 was rejected over U.S. Patent 5,978,855 (Metz, already of record) in view of Hu; and independent Claim 14 was rejected over U.S. Patent 6,141,689 (Yasrebi, already of record) in view of U.S. Patent 6,754,714 (Chevrolu, already of record) in view of Hu.

The remaining claims are all dependent, and all were rejected under § 103(a), as above, or further in view of other U.S. patents which are already of record.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested, as explained more fully below.

As understood from the rejection, Hu's disclosure at columns 11 and 12 describes the provision of content from a content server via either a direct connection between first and second network computers, or a referential transfer from a first network computer to a network server that is identified by the second network computer from a reference thereto. See pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, which also relied on Figures 1 and 2 of Hu.

Despite any such disclosure in Hu, none of the applied art concerns the issuance of a job ticket between a cable head end (CHE) and a set top box (STB). The claims herein have been amended to emphasize communications between the CHE and the STB, and also to emphasize the interplay of the job ticket.

In this regard, the rejection of Claim 13 relied on Metz as allegedly disclosing communications between a cable head end and a set top box. Likewise, the rejection of now-cancelled Claims 4 and 5 relied on U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0100059 (Buehl) as allegedly showing communication between a cable head end and a set top box. Applicants make no comment on the portions relied on by the Office Action in entering these rejections, but rather would simply note that neither apparently discloses anything that might concern the interplay of a job ticket, nor control over the job contemplated by such a job ticket by use of a message communication and a thread.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein recite subject matter that would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of the cited references, and allowance of the claims herein is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 119612v1